

F4083

PROVINCIAL POLITICS.

HON. OLIVER MOWAT,

TO HIS CONSTITUENTS,

AT

TAVISTOCK, JANUARY 15th, 1890,

AND ALSO

A SUPPLEMENTARY MEMORANDUM.

No. 3.

**The New Party in its Relations to the Political Parties
of the Province.**

APPENDIX:


An Extract from the "Good Templar of Canada."

LP
F5012
1890
M93P

TORONTO, JANUARY, 1890.

Toronto:
PRINTED BY HUNTER, ROSE & COMPANY.

1890.



THE NEW PARTY.

The following is a full report of Hon. Mr. Mowat's speech at Tavistock, on Wednesday, January 15th:—

I am extremely grateful for the support which I have received from you during the seventeen years, and more, that through the confidence of the Ontario people I have held the office of Premier of the Province. I believe that I have done all for the riding that any local member could have done. I know that has been my wish and endeavor. You have been most unexacting and considerate with respect to my personal presence amongst you, in order that I should be free to give my time to the general interests of the Province. This again deserves my grateful acknowledgement. I have within the last few weeks spoken in the riding at five places chosen with the assistance of friends who thought the meetings at these places would give to all who wished an opportunity of hearing and seeing me. I have since had urgent requests for meetings at some other points, of which Tavistock is one, and I have had much pleasure in finding that I could be here to-day. I may, perhaps, be able to visit one or two other places before the Legislature meets on the 30th of this month. My speeches elsewhere have been reported and have been read by many of you. To-day, therefore, I should like to take up, as far as I may, some subject not discussed in my former speeches, though it may be impossible wholly to exclude the topics already discussed. With this view I purpose to-day to take as my subject the

NEW OR THIRD PARTY,

which has for a time got into our Provincial politics.

I believe this party exaggerates very much its own importance; but as a politician I am not in favor of despising and ignoring any hostile movement, and therefore certainly not one which has for its principal leader and its President a minister of the Gospel,

and has among its associates other ministers of the Gospel. The New Party makes great pretensions and great claims, and no doubt may at the next general election be a disturbing element in some constituencies, though not in North Oxford. I have not heard of any Reformers here joining the New Party, though there may be some. The fact of a minister of the Gospel being the leader has naturally attracted some Reformers elsewhere, excellent men, but men perhaps who have not been strong politicians, or followed closely the operations of political parties. I doubt not that, in joining the New Party and supporting it, these Reformers believe that they are doing God service. With much respect for them all, I do not think that in this they are doing God service. Their motives are beyond all praise, but their action in regard to this New Party, I venture to think, is a mistake. I have been a pretty close student of politics and politicians for 35 years and more, with all the advantages which public life during most of that time, and official life for more than half of it, have given to me, and I say, with the greatest respect, but with confidence, that this New Party is not in the country's interest, and that so far as it may exert any influence on public affairs, that influence is likely to be evil and not good. I will tell you how and why.

The motto adopted, "For God and Our Country," sounds well; and some of the planks in the New Party platform are attractive to both Reformers and Conservatives. Prohibition is an attractive plank to many; "Righteousness and Truth in Public Affairs," and "Equal Rights for All," are attractions for more. Then the new organ of the party, *The Canadian Nation*, announces its aim to be "to unite the Christian sentiment of the country, to demand truth and honesty in politics as well as in ordinary business, and to make righteousness the guardian star of our national life." These are good things which all good men of every party desire. Whether the formation of this New Party will bring them about, or is adopting a plan of action that will help to bring them about, is another matter. But, in view of the expressed aims of the party, I can quite understand some good Conservatives becoming New Party men. The

MISDEEDS OF THE CONSERVATIVE LEADERS

and representatives have been revolting to some of the best of their followers, who, notwithstanding, do not like to become avowed Reformers after having long been the opponents of Reformers. They hated the Pacific Scandals; and some of them helped in 1873 to defeat the Government which had been guilty

of those scandals, though at the election of 1878 they returned to their party, some of them for the sake of the so-called National Policy, and some of them under the hope that, after having been for five years out of office, their party leaders would have been improved. There was disappointment in both results. The National Policy has not accomplished for the country what they had been led to expect, and they have found deterioration in other respects where they had hoped for improvement. Since, they have been indignant at the attempt of the Dominion Government and Dominion Parliament to deprive our Province of half its territory, and at the avowed policy of compelling the Ontario Government to abandon the territory, law or no law. They have disapproved of the attacks made on Provincial rights by the disallowance, year after year, of the Streams Act, in the interests of an influential partisan; and by other measures of the Dominion Government or Dominion Parliament in the same direction. They were aghast at the callous neglect, delay and mismanagement which drove the Halfbreeds and Indians of the North-west into rebellion; causing the loss of hundreds of lives, and frightful suffering by women and children, and by missionaries and ministers of the Gospel of peace and goodwill; causing also the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars of public money in the suppression of the outbreak; and causing the postponement for years of the development and settlement of the territory. They have been

SHOCKED AT THE BRIBERY.

from time to time of individuals, the bribery of constituencies, and the bribery of a Province, at the expense of public property and the public interests. They have been alarmed at the use for these bad purposes of blind shares; of contractors' gifts; of timber limits, cattle ranches and coal lands, belonging to the public; of railway grants not in the public interest; and of a system of better terms to one Province or another, to the disadvantage always of the Province of Ontario. They were shocked to learn that in two years 115 Orders in Council had been granted by the Dominion Government for timber limits without public competition, and for trifling considerations as compared with the magnificent sums which the Ontario Government had from 1872 until the present time obtained for timber limits in this Province by pursuing a different policy. They disapprove of the extravagant expenditure of the Dominion Government and the Dominion Parliament, and the enormous increase which has taken place in the public debt of the Dominion. They disapprove of the expensive,

unjust, troublesome, indefensible, Franchise Act, costing the Dominion exchequer some half-a-million of dollars for the preparation of unnecessary voters' lists, and costing large sums besides to the Conservatives and Reformers of every constituency. They were indignant at the infamous gerrymandering of the Ontario Constituencies for the undenied and undeniable purpose of weakening opponents, though the existing arrangements were already unjust to them. They felt resentful at the disallowance of the Manitoba Railway Acts for building at the expense of the Province itself railways needed for the development and prosperity of that Province. They have been indignant at the commission of all these and other iniquities by their Dominion leaders, and at the defence of them by their Provincial leaders, and by the organs of their party. They have wholly disapproved of the aid and countenance given by their Provincial leaders and representatives to the Dominion authorities in the attacks made from time to time on the rights and interests of their own Province. They have greatly disliked, in view of all these things, to see these Provincial leaders content

TO POSE AS LIEUTENANTS

of the Dominion authorities; content to adopt their policy without reference to Provincial interests; more than content to get into power by the strength of the party of the Dominion. They have deplored so many acts of wrong-doing by their party until, in regard to some of these acts, not to speak of all, they have long been saying to themselves in the words of an eminent divine, whose personal leanings, like their own, are or were towards the same party:—"We must choke bribery or be choked. Pacific scandals, the insolent purchase of a Province with the intent to purchase the country, local railways to purchase counties in detail, blind shares for the purchase of members of Parliament, have all been defended. As well defend Sodom."

Still, most of these Conservatives have hitherto stood by their party, and have done so because it is their party. To some of them the "New Party" may be a relief. They can join it without surrendering, or seeming to be surrendering, to their old political opponents. So far as the new organization draws off from the Conservative party a few of its disgusted men, clerical or lay, the organization may, from our point of view, be doing a good work; and this is the only way in which the New Party is going to do any good as a party. You and I believe that in the country's interest a man had better belong to this New Party than to

the present Conservative party of this Province. But all experience is against the expectation that any large number of Conservatives will leave their party for any reason.

Reformers are in this position: All that is good and ripe for action in the platform of the New Party is

ALREADY IN THE PLATFORM

of the Reform party, and always has been. For example, with respect to "Righteousness and truth in our public affairs," I am as anxious for this to be so as the Rev. President of the New Party can be; and the Reform party as a body hold to that principle quite as firmly as any of the New Party can. So also, in regard to "Equal Rights for all." There is no good and true sense in which that plank can be taken that the principle does not find a home in the Liberal party of this Province. Every intelligent Reformer knows this.

The Reform party when in power has exemplified these principles as thoroughly as any party, however pure its purpose, could do. The Hon. Alexander Mackenzie was the leader of a Reform Government in the Dominion from 1873 to 1878; Reformers point with pride to the purity of his administration all that time; and its character in this respect is very generally admitted now-a-days by intelligent and fair-minded Conservatives also. In fact, Canadians generally feel a pride in the uprightness of the Canadian Administration during those five years; and, unless where it is politically inexpedient to make the admission, and where political expediency rules, they are heard speaking in that spirit. It was the devotion of Mr. Mackenzie and his Government to what they believed "righteousness and truth" that caused their defeat in 1878. The people were in considerable distress at that time from causes which were beyond Government control. Whether Protection and a high tariff would relieve the distress and be a good thing otherwise, was a question as to which men might honestly differ, and did differ. Neither Conservatives nor Reformers had previously been Protectionists, or advocates of a tariff higher than was necessary for revenue purposes. The Conservative leaders were still in bad odor from the discoveries which had led to their defeat in 1873. As the General elections of 1878 were approaching, they looked around for a Cry to help them out of the mire, and, fortunately for themselves, they hit upon

THE CRY OF PROTECTION,

though at the time as a kind of forlorn hope. Mr. Mackenzie and his colleagues did not believe that Protection was a good

thing, or that any advances in the tariff would be a good thing; they therefore declined to favor any advance; and the elections went against them. It has since been commonly thought and said that, if they had consented to a comparatively small increase in the tariff, the Reformers who left them at the election of 1878 would have been content, and would have supported them as before. But the Government preferred defeat to a policy which, according to their view of truth and righteousness, they could not honestly adopt.

Then, as for the Reform party in Provincial affairs, its record has been so satisfactory to Reformers and others that, at every general election during the eighteen years which have elapsed since Mr. Blake took office as the first Ontario Reform Premier, a decided majority of the Government candidates have been returned by the people. When no election is near you hear even Conservatives, fair-minded and intelligent Conservatives, frankly admitting that they have nothing to say against the Ontario Government; and a sprinkling of them almost everywhere have always voted for our candidates. Outside of Ontario, and in all the Provinces of the Dominion, it is well known that Ontario has long been regarded as the model Province in regard both to legislation and to the administration of public affairs. Conservative journals in the other Provinces, not being interested in our defeat, have repeatedly given expression to the same view. The latest of these is *The Richmond Guardian*, a Quebec Conservative journal. That journal lately said:—"Ontario has always been economically and wisely governed, which is more than can be said for Quebec, past or present; and we regard it as morally and patriotically bad policy to keep hounding at Mr. Mowat in the fashion common with the Federal Government partizans. Let Mowat alone and attend to your own business."

THE PLATFORM ADOPTED BY THE NEW PARTY

has nine planks, of which I have mentioned three. Of the remaining six, three relate to Dominion matters, not to Provincial—an Elective Senate; Manhood Suffrage (in elections to the Legislative Assembly we have Manhood Suffrage now); and "Retrenchment and Economy in public expenditure, with a view to reducing our enormous national debt." The debt certainly is enormous, and has since Confederation made fearful leaps upwards under Conservative Administrations, until in 1883 the net debt had reached no less a sum than \$234,531,358, according to Dominion Sessional Paper No. 2, 1889. Three other of the planks

may perhaps refer to Provincial as well as Dominion matters: the Extension of the Franchise to Women; Civil Service Reform—what specially is meant by this I have not observed any definite explanation; and “a national sentiment, a national literature, and in all matters of public policy our country first”—to which few of any party are opposed.

For carrying out the platform, the present announced policy, as set forth by the new organ, is, not to support candidates for the next Ontario Legislative Assembly nominated by either Conservatives or Reformers, even when the candidates so nominated announce themselves as favorable to one or more planks of their platform. The New Party are everywhere to select candidates of their own. They are told that the opinions of a candidate of any other party “cannot change either the constitution or the leadership of his party,” and that the duty of all friends of the New Party is to stand by their own platform, and their own candidate. Whether this policy will be carried out when the elections come on we shall see.

PROHIBITION

is made the most prominent at present of all the planks, and a chief objection made by the organ to the Reform party is, that that party is not, as a party, for Prohibition. I am not going to discuss Prohibition here. The Reform party consists both of Reformers who believe in Prohibition, and of Reformers who do not. And there are a multitude of the strongest reasons why, in the interest of Prohibition and good government, at the coming Provincial elections Reformers who are Prohibitionists should not consent to withdraw from the Reform party, or to withhold their votes from Reform candidates, as the organisers and leaders of this New Party urge on them to do.

First of all, Prohibition is not a matter with which the Ontario Assembly has to deal. It belongs to the Dominion Parliament. It is a Dominion issue, not a Provincial issue. No man who does not desire the defeat of the Reform Government of Ontario for other reasons than Prohibition can intelligently desire their defeat at the next General Election because of all the party not being Prohibitionists.

Then, it is perfectly certain that for the term which the new Provincial Assembly is to last the question is, not whether the Provincial Government shall be in the hands of the New Party or of Prohibitionists, but whether it shall be in the hands of Reformers or Conservatives, of one or the other. Let no Reformer permit

himself to be deceived as to this. It is perfectly certain that Prohibitionists are not yet numerous enough to win a majority of the Ontario constituencies; and without a majority they cannot possess themselves of the Government. By running candidates of their own the New Party may contribute to the victory of one or other of the two existing parties, but they are not likely to win a single constituency for a candidate of their own. The recent election

IN WEST LAMBTON

is an illustration of this. West Lambton is a strong Temperance constituency. The county carried the Scott Act by a majority of over 3,000, though Lambton, like Oxford, has since reversed this vote. The agitation which the Jesuit Estates Act created had also been taken up in Lambton by many local leaders and prominent citizens of both the Reform and Conservative parties, and had great influence with the whole Protestant population of the riding; and this also helped the New Party. During the recent contest the public were told by *The Bulletin*, then the organ of the New Party, that "West Lambton was one of the first constituencies organised on the basis of the new platform." The party chose a candidate whose antecedents as a well known Conservative were expected to make him acceptable to Orange and other Conservatives; and he was in the field before either the Reformers or Conservatives had nominated a candidate. The eloquent President, and other influential gentlemen of the party, made speeches at public meetings during the campaign. The greatest possible activity was displayed by the local leaders; and the organ said that great enthusiasm for the party was manifested. But the result was that their candidate received only 775 votes, while the Reform candidate received 2,502, and the Conservative 1,842; and many Reformers, while withholding their votes from the Reform candidate for personal or local reasons, did so on the avowed ground that the loss of one supporter in the Legislative Assembly was of no consequence to us, and that at the general election they meant to be as active as ever in favor of the Reform candidate, whoever he should be. Some other Reformers voted for the New Party candidate because of pledges inconsiderately given and regretted.

The New Party journal now announces great satisfaction with the number of votes which Mr. McRae, their candidate, received. The New Party now imagine that the vote was all they expected, or more than all. Their organ says that their candidate led the forlorn hope of his party, and intimates that his candidature had

other purposes than the expectation of his being elected. As to the Reform candidate, Mr. Charles MacKenzie, having been successful, it is now said that "there was nothing surprising about this. Even with two candidates in the field, it (the success of the New Party candidate) would have been a difficult task, while with three it was impossible." But the facts as to their expectation of success, and as to the expected effect of there being three candidates, were far otherwise—if the public assurance of the New Party organ during the contest were conceived in truth and righteousness. When their candidate was nominated the public were told that "the enthusiasm of the Convention was unbounded"; that "it will be a stiff, uphill fight, but with thorough organization and earnest efforts a splendid victory may be gained." A meeting held the following evening was declared to have "overflowed with enthusiasm." In subsequent numbers their candidate's prospects were announced to be so bright as to have excited "the thorough alarm of the Liberal leaders," and even their "positive consternation." It was declared that "staunch Liberals all over the riding refuse to support the Liberal nominee, and are voluntarily offering to support Mr. McRae"; and that "the New Party is growing rapidly every day in West Lambton, and the conviction grows that it is going to win." In the August number of *The Bulletin* it was announced in large type:—"Lambton bids good-bye to the old parties; a battle to be fought; and we are going to win." A letter was copied from another journal affirming that "the prospects are that West Lambton will on the day of election roll up a majority for Mr. McRae." The editors themselves asserted that "the electors of West Lambton will vindicate the cause of right and truth, and do honour to themselves by returning Mr. McRae at the head of the poll." With respect to the effect of there being

THREE CANDIDATES,

the organ announced to the public when the third, the Conservative, Mr. Fleck, was nominated, that his nomination would "not change the situation so far as the New Party is concerned, but it clears the atmosphere of misapprehensions. . . . Lambton is to have a three-cornered contest, which is all the better for the New Party." The organ directors never changed their minds as to this. In October the public were told that "prospects in West Lambton are decidedly good. Meetings have been held all over the Riding, and new adhesions to the party are of frequent occurrence." In an editorial there was the following statement:

"Don't be misled by timid and chicken-hearted men. They will say you can't succeed. * * * * The answer is plain. You can succeed. There are enough Prohibitionists alone to secure a victory if true to their principles." In another article the Prohibitionists were told: "You can elect him if you will." In the November number the public were again told of the holding of meetings in the riding; and that the "tide of popular feeling for McRae is rising every day." It had not diminished since previous numbers announced with confidence an expected victory. On the contrary, in another paragraph of the same number addressed to the electors of West Lambton a long question is put, in substance whether they will send McRae or one of his opponents to the Legislative Assembly, and then follows this: "We trust that you will answer it with a majority for McRae like that with which you carried the Scott Act in 1884." The Scott Act was carried by upwards of 3,000 over the two Ridings of Lambton. The New Party would not be content with mere victory for their candidate; they insisted at the very eve of the election that not only would there be victory, but victory by an enormous majority.

What are we to think of the New Party, claiming as they do superiority in truth and righteousness over all others, when in the face of these statements, we find them after the election intimating to us that a vote of 775 was all they expected, or more? And that, there having been three candidates, "success was impossible?" Were all the statements of the organ to the contrary mere matter of election tactics, and neither true nor righteous? Does the special party of truth and righteousness recognize the legitimacy of dishonesty of this kind in elections? I am quite sure many of its members do not. But does not the use of such tactics show that the whole organization is a mistake? That it is not through this New Party, or any new party, that the cause of truth and righteousness in public affairs is to be advanced? That that object is to be best attained by good men of the two existing parties taking an active part in public affairs as electors and candidates, and bringing their love of what is good to bear on the methods and operations of their party? Is not the idea Quixotic, of promoting truth and righteousness by isolating good men from the two great historic parties, and leaving these parties to be manipulated without check by the less scrupulous of their members? Is not such a plan plainly unpractical for real good, and injurious instead of helpful to the cause of righteousness and truth?

TORONTO MAYORALTY.

The West Lambton election is one illustration of the uselessness of the New party. The Toronto election to the Mayoralty is another illustration. One of the candidates for the Toronto Mayoralty, Mr. McMillan, had been prominent in the Equal Rights agitation, and thereby made many new friends, and his candidature had the active support of the New Party. One of the leading editorials in the first number of their new organ was devoted to his praises, and to obtaining for him the votes of Liberals. It truly said of him that his "record, both public and private, is above reproach." He had likewise the advantage of being an Orangeman, and of dividing the Orange Conservative vote with Mr. Clarke, his opponent. He had also been an active Reformer; and though, irrespective of politics, *The Globe* favored the election of Mr. Clarke for another year, and recommended the postponement of Mr. McMillan's candidature until next year, yet the President of the Toronto Reform Association and most of its active members were in Mr. McMillan's favor and voted for him, as did a majority of the Reformers generally. These constituted a large addition to the "New Party" vote. On the other hand, his opponent, Mr. Clarke, had been twice Mayor already, and there was a prejudice against any one standing for a third term. What was still more important, he had estranged from himself those of his former Orange and other Conservative supporters who had been excited by the Equal Rights agitation, and many of them worked energetically against him throughout the contest. The New Party voted for Mr. McMillan to a man, and worked for him enthusiastically; and yet, with all the advantages of the additional support he had from other quarters, he was defeated by a majority of 1,894, at the very centre of the New Party movement.

THE SCHEME.

Though the leaders of the New Party hoped to carry West Lambton, or at all events their organ pretended they did, I have not observed that they profess to expect a majority of successful candidates of their own at the general election. Sometimes, I understand, they frankly admit that they have no such expectation. Their very platform shows that they cannot have. It contains so many planks, and some of these of such a nature, that but a small minority of the electors of the Province can possibly be expected to adopt them all for many years to come, if they ever do. The plank "Prohibition" excludes all but Prohibitionists; and it

is unquestionable that Prohibitionists are yet a minority of the electorate. But even many Prohibitionists are excluded, for a member of the party must not only be a Prohibitionist, but must be prepared to insist also on an Elective Senate, Woman Suffrage at Parliamentary elections, and other measures, on which Prohibitionists are far from being agreed. So also I find in the organs denunciations of Unrestricted Reciprocity and its advocates, quite in the line of *The Empire* and other Conservative newspapers. Many Conservatives believe in Unrestricted Reciprocity, and regard it of great importance to the country. Opposition to Unrestricted Reciprocity has nothing to do with the nine planks, but it makes the New Party somewhat nearer to the great body of Conservatives, who as a party are against that measure. Their hope evidently is that in some constituencies in which Prohibitionists are numerous, and Conservatives are not strong enough to elect a Conservative, they may refrain from putting a candidate into the field, and may prefer voting for a New Party candidate (a Conservative otherwise, as Mr. McRae in Lambton was), in order to defeat the Reform candidate. When elected, such a candidate will sit and vote every day with other Conservatives, and may not have occasion to air his New Party views once during a whole session. In like manner their organs adopt as their own, without a pretence of examination, the false and refuted charges made by the Opposition press against the Ontario Government. They eulogise the Opposition leader as with all his faults even "too good" a man for his party. Most Prohibitionists who are earnest Reformers perceive what all this means. I hope that before it is too late all will do so. I shall be surprised if they do not.

AGAINST THE REFORM PARTY.

While it is perfectly certain that the New Party will not and cannot, as the result of the coming election, take the place of the Reform party in governing the province, the only possible effect of its operations is to weaken one of the old parties more than the other; and the hope of those (whoever they are) that really direct the policy of the party evidently is, that the party so weakened will be the Reform party. If any of the leaders of the New Party do not perceive this, I must say that these are being made use of by those who do perceive it. The harm which in any constituency the New Party may do to the Reform party is, by withdrawing from us, where a constituency is close, the votes of more Reformers than they withdraw of Conservatives from the Conservative candidate. If earnest Reformers are

not on their guard they may thus be used to defeat their own party, and to place in office their opponents, the Conservatives, and without anything being gained for Prohibition or any other good thing. That result, I venture to say, every Prohibitionist Reformer would regard with the greatest possible aversion. The President refers to this matter, in another connection and in exaggerated terms, averring that the party leaders whom he opposes are "convinced that there is a new factor in the political problem of sufficient value to turn the scale in any constituency, as its weight may be thrown to the one side or the other." But its weight may be thrown to one side or against the other, not merely by obtaining votes for the candidate of one side, but also by withdrawing to a candidate of their own, whom they cannot elect, votes which would otherwise go to the other side, and, in a close constituency, would give to the other side a majority; and that is the evident purpose in view. Any special danger to the Reform party lies in the fact of there being in most constituencies more Reformers than Conservatives who favor an Elective Senate, Woman's Suffrage, and other planks of the New Party platform.

It being quite certain that Prohibitionists cannot hope, and do not hope, that this New Party will obtain a majority, or take the place of

EITHER OF THE EXISTING PARTIES,

what is its formation to effect beyond what would be accomplished by its members occupying themselves, as individuals and otherwise, in leavening both parties with their views? The formation of a separate party means for Reformers that they are to become indifferent to everything else in legislation or government which they have heretofore contended for. Because they cannot get Prohibition, they are asked to do their best, not to make law and government in other respects better, but to allow all to go as wrong and as bad as may be. They are asked to say that until they get Prohibition some years hence, if ever, they would just as soon have meanwhile a Government so bad that you could no more defend it than you could defend Sodom, as to have in the meantime a Government of pure-minded, patriotic men. They are asked to say that for them, without Prohibition, there is no difference between good government and bad government, or between good laws and bad laws.

There is abundant other evidence that the organisation is being used by its directors, whoever these are, for the special purpose of injuring the Reform party. When the Conservative party

is blamed in the New Party organ, both parties are said to be equally blameable; but when the two parties are compared, the pretence always is that the Reform party is the worse, and by far the worse. I will give you some of the statements of the New Party organ in proof of this policy, in order that Reformers may not, by mistakes and misstatements, be led into assisting un-awares the party they have always justly condemned.

In the first organ of the New Party, it was asserted that—"righteousness and truth had been ruled out of the politics of both parties." Intelligent Reformers know that righteousness and truth have not been ruled out of the politics of the Reform party. Intelligent Reformers know that the Reform party is

BASED ON TRUTH AND RIGHTEOUSNESS;

and Reformers generally of all Churches have manifested their knowledge of the fact at every general election during my Premiership. Again, the leaders of the two parties are spoken of as "leaders who, by putting party above country, have led their followers by crooked and dirty ways into entangled and disgraceful alliances." Reformers know that this is false as to the Reform leaders. They know that we have not put party before country; they know that we, like our fellow Reformers generally, are for our party because in that way we are for the country. They know that we have not advocated "crooked and dirty ways." We have made no "entangling and disgraceful alliances." Speaking in reference to the coming Provincial elections, the country is falsely described by the organ as in "a quagmire of political corruption," out of which it is the mission of the New Party to lift it. It is false to assert any such corruption as respects the Reform party or leaders. The organ copies from another journal an expressed expectation that the New Party is about to "make the country a decent one to live in." I venture to say there is no part of the world more decent to live in than the Province of Ontario is now, notwithstanding the N. P. and the grave faults of the Dominion Government. Again, speaking expressly of the Liberal party, it is said that "honest and upright men have been disgusted with the course of their leaders." On the contrary, it is honest and upright men who are and always have been our chief supporters. The new organ says that "the Liberal party like the Conservative is dominated by its worse elements." I say that the Liberal party is dominated by its best elements, in regard both to the electorate and to the representatives they have chosen; and that the best elements as well as all other elements know and understand this.

One or other of the organs has said many false and absurd things as to our relations with the liquor interest. Now, it is well-known that the liquor interest has always been Conservative, and includes very few Reformers. In the interest of the New Party the false assertion is made that we are dominated by the liquor interest; while our Conservative opponents have always insisted that the liquor interest is dominated by us, and that we compel those engaged in the liquor trade to vote for the Reform party against their own wish and will. The organ deems it expedient to say that "both parties stand together flat-footed and square-toed upon the one plank—the saloon." "The saloon power is a ruling element in both parties, threatening defeat in case of refusal to do its bidding." These are very absurd and

WHOLLY FALSE STATEMENTS,

so far as the Reform party is concerned. Year after year we have passed acts at the instance of the Temperance organizations and against the wishes and interests of the liquor dealers. We have not passed everything Temperance organizations desired, because the Reform party does not consist exclusively of the members of those organizations; and the legislation proposed, in order to be carried, needs to have the support of friends of Temperance who do not belong to those organizations, and do not concur in all their views. But our legislation has been in the direction desired by Temperance men, and has assuredly not been in the interest of liquor men. In fact, we have heard from many quarters of Tory Temperance men endeavoring to persuade Reform tavern-keepers (of whom there are some, although they are a small minority) that they should vote against Reform candidates now, because of our Temperance legislation. It is false that the Reform party stand "flat-footed" or footed in any other way, "square-toed" or with any other kind of toes, "upon the plank of the saloon."

So, the record of the Ontario Government is spoken of as a record which could not be defended—that the Liberal party organizer had been sent into Lambton to "whitewash a record he could not defend." Could not defend? The notorious facts are the very contrary. The record of the Reform Party has been so satisfactory that it has been practically unassailable, instead of being indefensible. It is on account of our record being so satisfactory to the people of the Province that, but for the religious agitation which our opponents are endeavoring, as a matter of political tactics, to turn to their advantage, the case of our opponents would be desperate; and it continues desperate, notwithstanding that agitation.

But the New Party organs do not leave to inference the side which has the special sympathy of the real directors of the party, whoever they are. The members and friends of the party are expressly told that, while "voting the Conservative ticket in Canada" is "throwing the vote away"; on the other hand, "a vote for the Reform party, from a moral standpoint is worse than thrown away." Wherever there is an acknowledged difference between the two parties, the Reformers are always asserted to be decidedly the worse party, and the Conservatives the better party. Thus this language is used:—"The only respect in which they (the Conservatives) differ from the Liberals is in their opposition to Commercial Union"; and elsewhere the same organ says, "Commercial Union means political union—annexation to the United States, and is an annexation fad." Some no doubt think so, and some think the reverse. Many Conservatives favor Unrestricted Reciprocity, as most Reformers do, and they do not think, as I do not, that it involves Annexation, to which all of us are opposed. As for Unrestricted Reciprocity being the only difference between the two parties, intelligent Reformers know that there are many other grave differences between the Reform party and the Conservative party besides Unrestricted Reciprocity.

Time will not permit of my giving to-day some further illustrations which I had noted of the true character and aims of those, whoever they are, that are directing the policy and proceedings of this New Party; but what I have said is surely sufficient without more to demonstrate that the party is under

DECIDEDLY CONSERVATIVE INFLUENCES,

however this has come about, and has decidedly Conservative aims; that its proceedings are not governed by its professed principles; that the party has no chance, and its leading director, have no expectation, of success for the party for many years if ever, and that unless those Reformers who sympathise more or less with its platform or some of its planks, are wide awake, they are going to be used in the interest of the Conservative party at the coming elections, and without advancing, but on the contrary prejudicing, the objects for which Reformers join the party. I am glad to know that the Reformers of North Oxford are already alive to all this, and are ready to do, each according to his opportunities, what he can to make others alive to it also.

SUPPLEMENT.

Mr. Mowat mentioned at the close of his speech at Tavistock as to the New Party, (January 15), that he had noted other illustrations of his subject besides those mentioned in his speech. A desire having been intimated that he should give to the public what remains, either in a speech somewhere or otherwise, he has partly written and partly dictated the following memorandum, by way of supplement to his speech :—

Besides what I had time to mention in my speech at Tavistock, there are still other reasons why Reformers will not attach much importance to the nominal platform of this New Party. Take for example, the, first plank, "Righteousness and Truth." I do not doubt that this plank has attracted to the party some God-fearing men, clergymen and laymen ; but political parties, and even religious societies, do not consist wholly of men who really appreciate and practically illustrate the principles of the party or society. The New Party will not be so absurd as to claim to be an exception. How have the organs of the New Party illustrated the principle of "Righteousness and Truth?" I gave some examples in my speech. I may select a few more.

PROHIBITION.

The organ for September said that "The Ontario Government has committed itself squarely against Prohibition and Equal Rights." Yet this is absolutely untrue. The Ontario Government has not "committed itself squarely," or at all, against either Prohibition or Equal Rights. As to Prohibition, the Ontario Legislature, as I have already said, has not even jurisdiction. Prohibition belongs to the Dominion. The Ontario Government has had no occasion to "commit itself" on the subject. It is false also to speak of the Government as "hostile to Prohibition," as has also been done. Several members of the Government are friends of Prohibition; some of them have so expressed themselves on various public occasions. All the members of the Government are alive to the evils of intemperance, and are personally friendly to Temperance measures; but some at least are of opinion that

public sentiment in most parts of the Province is not strong enough in favor of either the Scott Act or Prohibition to make possible the adequate enforcement of either by any Constitutional Government, and that, without a stronger public sentiment in support of either law, its premature adoption may do more harm than good. The popular vote on the question may be misleading. In most municipal counties, even where the majority for the adoption of the Scott Act was large, the electors could not afterwards be got to vote at the municipal elections in sympathy with the Act. Other local questions, and personal preferences for this or the other candidate, outweighed from the first the interest which the people felt in enforcing the Act their votes had brought into force. They elected Municipal Councils that were adverse to the Act, and would do nothing for its enforcement. I believe all the members of the Government feel that the advocacy of the Act and of Temperance measures generally, the statistics collected, the facts brought to light, the attention aroused to the enormous evils of intemperance, all these things do good, and prepare public opinion for whatever legislative measures may be in the interest of morality and religion. I myself as an elector and ratepayer have voted for the Scott Act (which is the nearest approach to Prohibition that we have had), and I have never voted in an opposite way. I have also been for many years a willing contributor to the funds of Temperance Associations which favor Prohibition.

EQUAL RIGHTS AND FRENCH SCHOOLS.

As to the Ontario Government having committed itself "squarely" against Equal Rights, that also is quite incorrect. Curiously enough, the organ professed to found the statement on the report of the Commissioners recently appointed to investigate the subject of French Schools. No other ground is pretended. Because it appears from the Report that, as the organ said, "in some of these schools French is taught almost to the exclusion of English, while in others the Catholic Catechism is taught as part of the daily exercises," it is inferred that the leaders of the Liberal party have "deliberately adopted the policy of conceding to the Church of Rome whatever she chooses to demand." The charge is quite false. As to the teaching of French "almost to the exclusion of English," or as to the teaching of the Catholic Catechism, the Report does not contain the slightest ground for saying that these practices were introduced by us or in our time, or even had been continued without action on our part after our attention had been called to them. Quite the contrary. The report expressly states,

that for many years the French people had been allowed to conduct their schools in their own way, no exception being taken either by the Education Department or by the public. Speaking of a period long before our time, it was stated in the Report that special provision had been made to secure French teachers for their schools; and that French text books had been authorized for them. The Report says, that as far back as 1851 it was ordered by the Council of Public Instruction, "in regard to teachers of French, that a knowledge of French grammar be substituted for a knowledge of English grammar, and that the certificate to the teacher be expressly limited accordingly;" and that by resolution of the Council of Public Instruction, dated April 20th, 1868, the French text books herein specified were authorised for use in French Schools in Ontario. The same report further says:—

There can be no question as to the fact that in all the French Schools in the several counties visited, notwithstanding particular cases of backwardness or inefficiency, an effort is being made to impart a knowledge of the English language; and not only so, but this work is receiving a larger amount of attention at present than in former years. There are some of those schools in which English has been well taught for many years, so that they are practically English Schools. There are also some, as will be seen from the statistical statement forming part of the report, in which the English language is largely used in the work of the school. This is the case more particularly in the Counties of Essex and Kent.

There are some schools in which the time given to English and the use of that language in the schools are too limited; but even in these more attention is paid to English than formerly, and the use of it in the work of instruction is greater than it was a few years ago.

In recent speeches to my constituents, I gave further details as to how the matter really stood. I showed from documentary evidence, that the teaching of French "almost to the exclusion of English" had been deliberately permitted by the educational authorities for more than 20 years before our time, and without objection; that the subject had been brought before the Chief Superintendent of Education, the Rev. Dr. Ryerson, officially, as early at least as 1851; that he did not then or afterwards see his way to any governmental or departmental interference; and that the principle involved was before the Council of Public Instruction repeatedly between that date and the year 1876, without the Council procuring or recommending a change to be made. I showed that those present at the meetings of the Council were all Protestant clergymen of different denominations, and Protestant laymen not in political life. I showed that as far back as 1856, Dr. Ryerson sanctioned the use in these schools of books recom-

mended by the French dignitaries of the Church of Rome, and described as "exclusively devoted to the teaching of the peculiar dogmas of that Church." He did not think that any interference would be useful where all or most of the pupils were Roman Catholics; and neither he nor the Council of Public Instruction took any different course in regard to such books during Dr. Ryerson's time.

On the other hand, as far back as 1885 the Government had

BEGUN ACTIVE MEASURES

for having more English taught in these schools; and this distinctly appears from the very report referred to by the New Party organ. The report sets forth, among other things, a circular which the Education Department issued in September, 1885, giving special instructions with a view "to secure a better knowledge of the English language." To further promote that object, the Commissioners made certain recommendations, which have been approved of everywhere, and have been carried out by the Education Department in every particular in which the action of the Legislature beforehand is not needed.

As to the interval between Dr. Ryerson's incumbency and the year 1885, all that can be said is, that Mr. Crooks, his successor did not disturb the practice for so many years sanctioned by Dr., Ryerson and the Council of Public Instruction, acquiesced in by the public, and being the accepted policy of the Province; the matter not having been brought to the attention of the Government, and perhaps not to Mr. Crooks himself, from any quarter whatever. The continuance of this policy was not the result of any "demand" on the part of the Church of Rome, as falsely asserted. There had not only been no demand, but there had not been even any communication on the subject.

It was thus Dr. Ryerson, not the Ontario Government, that adopted the policy of permitting "almost exclusive" French teaching, and his Council during its existence of 30 years or more did not interfere with the Roman Catholic teaching. Would it be a fair inference from the practices so permitted, that the Rev. Dr. Ryerson and his Council of distinguished Protestant clergymen and laymen "had adopted the policy of conceding to the Church of Rome whatever she chooses to demand?" I presume the New Party organs or leaders will not say so. But as against the Liberal party that is what is said; while it is falsely assumed that the Ontario Government are the authors of the state of things condemned. This single fact must demonstrate to every thoughtful Reformer the

GROSS POLITICAL PARTISANSHIP

as well as the political unfairness, of those who are directing the policy of the New Party. They have taken their supposed facts from the Opposition press without even reading the report they refer to as their evidence. Or if they did read the report, so much the worse; for in that case their partisanship made them wholly blind to every statement in it which tended to disprove the charges they were determined to make against the Government.

The blindness still continues, for their organ refers to Mr. Ross's speeches in West Lambton in this way:—"Mr. Ross undertook to defend his notorious French school policy." This is said after it had been demonstrated, that Mr. Ross's policy was to have more English taught, and to remove what had been otherwise objectionable in the French Schools before his time; that he initiated a policy which has received the approval of all disinterested and intelligent men who have taken the trouble to learn the facts. The same organ continues from number to number to refer to the subject as if the facts were quite otherwise. Thus in the last number there is this statement:—"The recent disclosures of the shameful evasions of the School Law in certain sections of the Province, and the extent to which, under a winking Government, they have been *made* mere training schools for the acquisition of a foreign language and in the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, are too fresh in the public mind to need any reiteration." Was the policy of Dr. Ryerson and the Council of Public Instruction for 33 years "a shameful evasion of the School Law?" It was Dr. Ryerson and the Council of Public Instruction who were guilty, if any one was. Our part was, taking steps to change what is complained of, as soon as the facts came to the knowledge of any of us. There is not the shadow of ground for the pretence that it was in the time of this Government, if ever, that any of the schools referred to had been "*made mere training schools*" for the purposes mentioned. The editor or controller of the *Nation*, whoever he is, seems to accept as very gospel whatever he finds in an Opposition journal that may tell against the Ontario Government with those who can be got to believe it; and many may be expected to believe, without further inquiry, what they read in a journal supposed to be under close clerical direction and supervision, and to be the special representative of a party consisting

EXCLUSIVELY OF RIGHTEOUS MEN.

Many other illustrations of the way in which truth and righteousness are practised by the organs of the New Party are to be found. Take this paragraph:—"The *Canada Presbyterian* has enjoyed some fat Government printing, and is always ready to use his paper in defence of his employers." This also has the unmistakable ring of the Tory journals in their attacks on us. May not a public journal have confidence in us, and honestly, in the country's interest, desire our success? Does the cause of truth and righteousness require that an unworthy motive be ascribed to a religious journal because it manifests a leaning to the Reform party or some of its leaders? Then as to the facts. The Ontario Government are *not* employers of the *Canadian Presbyterian*. It is not employed by us for Government printing or for anything else. The proprietor had for one term the contract for Government printing, because his tender was the lowest of all the tenders sent in after the advertisement for tenders. His contract came to an end some years ago, and the work went to others for the next term, the tenders of these others being the lowest for the new term. The contract is now with a printing company whose principal partners are not in political sympathy with us. These facts are well known to all connected with the trade here, and probably elsewhere; but there may be many readers of the *Nation* who do not know them. The paragraph is for these.

Take another paragraph. The organ gave this sentence from the *Globe*:—"Fancy the figure Mr. Meredith would cut in accepting the leadership of Dr. Sutherland, and committing his his friends inextricably to an impossible programme of Prohibition, No-Popery, and Truth and Righteousness!" This evidently refers to the impossibility of Mr. Meredith getting into power by uniting with the New Party. But the comment of the organ is this:—"Observe! Prohibition, truth and righteousness, and resistance to Jesuit aggression, constitute from the *Globe's* point of view 'an impossible programme.' This shows what the country has to expect from the great Liberal party." Here the organ chooses to interpret the paragraph as showing the *Globe* to be against Prohibition, which the *Globe* has not been; and as being against "truth and righteousness and resistance to Jesuit aggression," while the *Globe* manager, in his anxiety that what he thought Jesuit aggression should be resisted, actually took a position of emphatic antagonism to the Reform representatives in the

Dominion House of Commons who should vote against the disallowance of the Jesuit Estates Act. Then, misrepresenting in this way the position of the *Globe*, the organ further assumes that the *Globe* is identical with the Liberal party, and says:—"This shows what the country has to expect from the great Liberal party." Is all this honest? The paragraph was evidently intended for the edification of Reformers attracted by the New Party platform and by the clerical element in its management. It meant to tell them, "Your party has no claim upon you; it is against not only Prohibition, but against truth and righteousness also, and any resistance to Jesuit aggression." But intelligent Reformers know the contrary. Their party is not only for truth and righteousness, but is against either Jesuit aggression or any other aggression on the public rights and interests.

One word here as to the Reformers who are amongst the 188 that voted against the disallowance of the Quebec Act

RESPECTING THE JESUIT ESTATES.

We ought not to overlook the fact, that the Ottawa Government had committed itself and its party against the disallowance of the Act; that if all the Ontario Reformers had voted for the motion it would still have been defeated, though by a smaller majority. Their votes would have been a protest against the Act, and would have been in accordance with the feelings of many Protestants, but would have had no effect on the action of the government or Parliament. Further, it is quite certain that our friends voted as they did, not because they favored the Jesuits, but because, like Hon. Mr. Joly, the Protestant ex-Premier of Quebec, they did not read the Act as implying what others regarded it as implying; and because they had for some years been contending, in the light of recent experience, that it was in the general interest of their own Province of Ontario and of the Dominion, that Provincial Acts within the jurisdiction of a Provincial Legislature should not be interfered with. An Act like the Jesuit Estates Act may be thought by others to have been an exceptional Act not falling within the principle so contended for, without impugning the honesty or the motives of the Reform members who took a different view.

Take another paragraph from the *Canadian Nation*: "A Lambton Liberal wrote to a friend, 'we have knocked truth and righteousness into a cocked hat.'" Even this ironical description of the new party of "truth and righteousness" in a private letter from we don't know whom, is pressed into service against the

whole Reform party, as if it proved that the Liberals were against truth and righteousness, and were rejoicing at the defeat of those virtues, instead of rejoicing that the party which wishes to be the exclusive depository of truth and righteousness had been "knocked into a cocked hat."

It is plain from these specimens, which might be multiplied, that, however pure the purpose of the clerical or other leaders, the New Party has already fallen into evil ways; and that when its organs want to discredit the Reform party or defeat a Reform candidate, resort is freely had to the very means which earnest clergymen who have been induced to speak at the New Party meetings justly condemned, and hoped that the New Party would drive out of politics.

I am far from ascribing to Dr. Sutherland personally all that I find in the accredited organs of his party; though, as these journals are the official organs of the party, he is in a sense responsible for what they have been permitted to state. But of Dr. Sutherland personally I would not say one unkind word. He is a distinguished minister of his church, and has, I doubt not, as such rendered good service to the cause of religion. But somehow he has allowed personal feeling of some kind to mislead him in this whole matter. I am sure that, in the midst of his missionary and ministerial labors, he has not had time or inclination to investigate for himself the matters to which I have referred, nor the charges repeated from Opposition journals against the Provincial Government and Provincial leaders. The *Bulletin* said of him:—"Dr. Sutherland was a staunch and consistent Liberal until the leaders by their course on the Riel question, and the Prohibition question, drove him (and thousands more) from the party." This would be curious, if true. The Riel question and the Prohibition question were Dominion questions, not Provincial; and yet they are represented as having turned the good Doctor against the whole Reform party, in Provincial as well as Dominion affairs.

AS TO THE RIEL QUESTION,

the Dominion Government are the parties responsible for Riel's execution. The Reform members of the House of Commons were divided. Mr. Mackenzie, Sir Richard Cartwright and others agreed with the Government that the sentence should have been carried into execution. Mr. Blake, for reasons which he stated with great power, was of a different opinion. On the vote the Ontario Reformers were about equally divided. There were like differences outside. Principal Grant, for example, who belongs

to no party, agrees with Mr. Blake. He said :—" I think to hang Riel would be criminal on our part; for, although law sanctions it, the most enlightened sentiment of the nineteenth century is against it." Which of the two opposite views disgusted Dr. Sutherland, the organ did not state. Are we to understand that he was disgusted because all the Reform leaders did not approve of the hanging, or was it because all did not *disapprove* of it? The want of unanimity one way or the other in such a matter would be a strange ground for changing any man's political leanings.

As for the other of the two grounds—the course of the Liberal leaders on the Prohibition question—the Reform Government passed the Scott Act, and that Act at the time of its being passed gave satisfaction to Temperance advocates. When experience disclosed defects in it, most of the Reform members of the House of Commons voted for their removal, and most of the Conservative members voted the other way. So, on the motions in the House of Commons respecting Prohibition, most of the Ontario Reformers voted for Prohibition and most of the Conservatives the other way. What particular step of the Liberal leaders with respect to the Prohibition question drove the Doctor from the Reform party the organ did not say.

The Doctor is strongly opposed to the

FEDERATION OF VICTORIA COLLEGE

with the Provincial University, and is the leader in the opposition to such federation. Referring to federation, it was said by the new organ, that "the Ontario government captured the Methodist General Conference in regard to its University." This extraordinary statement as to capturing the Methodist Conference shows the hostility of the writer (whoever he is) to the majority in the General Conference, whom he describes as being "captured," as well as to the Ontario government, who did the capturing. Such a statement indicates a state of mind which may account for any amount of aberration as to political parties or otherwise. I do not believe that any government or any external power could capture that great ecclesiastical body. What has led to such an amazing assertion? The Ontario government thought that it would be for the general good that all the Colleges connected with the Churches should unite with the Provincial University, so far as relates to as many as may be of the subjects of learning which are common to all. We thought, rightly or wrongly, that such a union would be for the advantage of the

Colleges and their supporters, as well as of the Provincial University; that federation would enable the resources of the Colleges to be utilised to the greatest possible advantage; that it would also be of great advantage to the young men of all Churches to associate in University education, as well as in our High and Public Schools, and would bring to bear on the Provincial institution the Christian influence of the Churches in a larger degree than is otherwise practicable. Dr. Nelles, the able and greatly lamented Chancellor of Victoria University, took in the first instance the same view, was a warm advocate of Federation, and rendered important service in framing a basis of union; though he afterwards thought that he had been wrong in all this, and had the courage to say so. The heads of all the other Colleges also were favorably disposed, and in the first instance aided in the work; at least all who, as in the case of the Provincial University, carried on their work in Toronto. Confederation always seemed to me to stand on stronger ground in their case than (for local and exceptional reasons) in that of Queen's University at Kingston. Our endeavor was with the assistance of representative men from all the Colleges to get a basis of union settled that should be reasonably satisfactory to the friends of all the Colleges; and such a basis was at length agreed to provisionally. The Ontario Legislature thereupon, at the instance of the Government, passed an Act unanimously which enabled Victoria University and other Universities to unite for certain purposes with the Provincial University, if they chose to do so. It was an enabling Act—nothing more. But so far from having captured the Conference, as absurdly asserted, or from having tried to capture it, we never thought of undertaking so Herculean a task. We did not try to influence a single member of the Conference, and I do not suppose we could have influenced one if we had tried. The question is wholly for the Methodists themselves, and it would have been as impertinent as useless for us to attempt to influence them in such a matter. On public grounds I should be glad if Victoria would unite with the Provincial University. All Methodists do not share that desire, but these do not on that account leave the Reform party, of which Methodists have always constituted an essential portion. Our policy in this matter cannot have had anything to do with Dr. Sutherland's opposition to the Reform party, as he took that position publicly in 1886, and our policy was not entered upon, I think, until subsequently.

THE PROVINCIAL LEADERS.

I referred in my speech at Tavistock to the way the New Party

organ speaks of Mr. Meredith, the Conservative leader. Alluding to the call of the *Hamilton Spectator* some time ago for another leader, the organ gave this as the New Party view:—"No one has ventured to accuse the present leader of any lack of ability, of honesty, of industry, or of any of those qualities which go to make up a successful statesman." Again:—"The gist of the *Spectator's* article is that Mr. Meredith is a good man but not a good leader. Read between the lines, and the cause of this seems to be that he is too good." Again, it is intimated that the objection of some of his party to him is his "overscrupulousness." All this is manifestly said in the

INTEREST OF THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY AND TO

make Reformers well disposed to its Provincial leader. On the other hand I observe in the last number of *The Nation* two references to myself. In one paragraph my speech at Sarnia is spoken of as "fraudulent," and as a "fraud" on "Christian sentiment, and truth and honesty and righteousness in public affairs"—these last words being quoted from another journal, where they did not refer to me. In another paragraph this remark is made:—"We are not anxious to have Mr. Mowat go. If he would only surround himself with honest advisers, and heartily adopt a platform of Prohibition and Equal Rights, we would rather keep Mr. Mowat than any other man in Ontario. But——" the organ does not finish the sentence. The adopting of the platform suggested means joining the New Party. As for surrounding myself with honest advisers, I am surrounded with honest advisers now; and as for joining the New Party, I cannot do so conscientiously or in the public interest. This proclaimed readiness to "keep" a member of the Government a public man who is at the same time denounced as having just made a fraudulent speech, is a little remarkable. The new organ contains in its first number

AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

"to the members and friends of Canada's New Party;" and in this address the Rev. Doctor does not disguise his special hostility to the Ontario government. The address is specially to Reformers, and to Reformers who are Prohibitionists; and one of its statements this: "That the Ottawa government is hostile to Prohibition we all know. That the Ontario government is equally so is now beyond dispute. By a policy of non-enforcement it killed the Scott Act, and made its attitude unmistakable by choosing a

pronounced Anti-Prohibitionist as its standard-bearer in West Lambton. And if further evidence were needed, the trend of policy is shown by the fact that the Central Reform Association has recently elected a retired liquor-dealer as its President." This is the sort of observation with which we are familiar in some Tory journals, from which, I fear, the Rev. Doctor now takes his opinions, except in so far as he is a Prohibitionist and they are not. In order to prove to Reformers the hostility of the Ontario government to Prohibition, the Rev. Doctor assumes that the government selected Mr. Charles Mackenzie as the Reform candidate for West Lambton. I suppose I may infer from the assumption in this case that it was not the

NEW PARTY IN WEST LAMBTON,

but the leaders elsewhere, that really chose Mr. McRae to be their candidate in West Lambton, and that the action of the West Lambton Convention in apparently choosing him was mere matter of form. However that may have been in the case of Mr. McRae, it was not so in the case of Mr. Mackenzie. I do not know that the Ontario government has ever had to do with the selection of one candidate rather than another at any Convention during my Premiership, except in one instance, that of my late esteemed colleague, Mr. Crooks. At the last election before his death, I found that there was a desire in South Oxford for another representative, and in the general interest I did endeavor, and successfully, to have Mr. Crook again chosen as the Reform candidate for the riding. With regard to West Lambton, we had nothing whatever directly or indirectly to do with Mr. Charles Mackenzie being chosen. He was the independent choice of a Convention of the representative Reformers of the riding, without one word of advice or other interference on our part. There were several names before the Convention, all, so far as I know, good men and true; all had their friends; and with any one of them I should have been well satisfied. Mr. Mackenzie, whom the Convention selected, was and is well worthy of public confidence, unless faith in Prohibition is an essential qualification. He has lived in the riding, carrying on a large and successful business, for many years, and bears the highest character over the whole county, even with political opponents. Many of those who voted for the New Party candidates will probably vote for Mr. Mackenzie if he is the candidate at the general election. Was it quite right to assume, and assert, that he was chosen by the Ontario government as its standard-bearer? Or does it not much matter in

politics what is assumed and asserted to make a point against opponents? Too many Conservative journals think it does not; but surely the Rev. Doctor is not of that opinion.

ENFORCEMENT OF DOMINION LAWS.

In the same address the reverend President says, that "enforcement belongs to Provincial authorities, and a prohibitory law from Ottawa would be of no avail so long as a hostile government reigned in Toronto;" and that "by a policy of non-enforcement it [THE ONTARIO GOVERNMENT] killed the Scott Act." Now, it is not the fact that we had a "policy of non-enforcement," or that as a government we are "hostile" to Prohibition. On the contrary, our policy was the enforcement of the Act wherever it was adopted. If any think that in some localities more could have been done than was done, whatever the cause of this may have been, it certainly was not a policy of non-enforcement on our part. A policy of non-enforcement was the confessed policy of the Dominion government.

Again, it is not correct, as the President assumes, that, as a matter of constitutional law, the enforcement of all the Dominion laws belongs to the Provincial and not to the Dominion authorities, or that the enforcement of a Prohibitory law would belong to us, and that, as he says, such a law "would be of no avail so long as a hostile government reigned in Toronto." That the enforcement of the Scott Act, a Dominion Act, was not the business of the Dominion Government, has sometimes been stated by Tory politicians, because such a view if accepted would relieve the Conservative government from all blame for the non-enforcement of the Act; and the Rev. Doctor chooses to assume that they are right in this view. If the constitutional doctrine were as asserted, which it is not, the fact would form no reason why Reformers should be influenced by that consideration at the approaching elections, for there is not the remotest chance of a prohibitory law being passed by the Dominion during the existence of the Assembly which will be elected this year. No intelligent Prohibitionist expects it. The number of members in the House of Commons of both the Liberal and Conservative parties favoring Prohibition may be increased at the Dominion election in 1892, unless the action of the New Party should prevent this; but Prohibitionists will still be a minority, and probably a small minority. Then, again, the Senate consists of life members, and contains a large majority of Conservative anti-Prohibitionists.

As to the theory that the enforcement of all Dominion laws belongs to the Province and not to the Dominion, so that a Dominion Act "would be of no avail" unless the Provincial Government chose to enforce it, the suggestion is absurd. Such a state of things would paralyse all Dominion legislation—would put the Dominion in the power of every Provincial government. The Constitution contains no such provision; the Dominion authorities having never contended for such a doctrine; nor has any Court in Canada suggested it. The Scott Act itself assumed the contrary, for it expressly appointed the Collectors of Inland Revenue to enforce the Act. Acting on the same view, the present Dominion government, though doing nothing to enforce the Scott Act, and refusing even to place at our disposal for that purpose the fines paid for violations of the law, yet are daily attending to the enforcement of their Customs and Excise laws, and every other Dominion law except, perhaps, what is understood as the "criminal laws."

The doctrine that the Dominion has the fullest jurisdiction to enforce its own laws is essential to the federal system. The like is the recognized doctrine in the United States. The Provincial Courts are open to the Dominion, as they are to all who have claims to enforce which fall within the jurisdiction of those Courts; and the ordinary officers of justice are at hand to discharge their duties. But when the Dominion Parliament passes a law which requires the creation of new agencies and special measures for its enforcement, the office of providing these belongs to the Dominion itself.

Thus the only practical ground on which Reformers are appealed to for opposing the Ontario government and the Reform candidates at the coming elections absolutely falls to the ground. The Rev. Doctor will find that he is never safe in taking his law, any more than his facts, against the Ontario government from Tory newspapers.

THE SCOTT ACT.

Though under no constitutional obligation to enforce a Prohibition Act, or such an Act as the Scott Act (except as I have mentioned), the Provincial Legislatures have certain powers which *enable* them to aid to a certain extent in enforcing it. Free Trade in liquor would be the consequence of either Act if not enforced; and as the Dominion government would do nothing whatever to enforce the Scott Act, it became necessary for all good citizens to take the matter into their own hands as far as they could; and the Ontario government was desirous of doing

what it could, just as any Temperance Society and any private citizen may have felt. Halton was one of the counties which adopted the Scott Act in 1884. The Act

BEING AN EXPERIMENT

which we wished to see tried under the most favorable circumstances practicable, we appointed there a Police Magistrate and officers selected by the friends of the Scott Act; and for some years we had the whole expense of enforcing the Act in that county paid out of the Provincial Treasury. The vote for the Scott Act has recently been reversed in that county as it has been in some other counties, but most certainly the reversal in Halton did not arise from any remissness of the Ontario Government; and the friends of the Act in Halton do not say it did.

In every other county which adopted the Scott Act the Commissioners and inspectors who had been appointed to enforce the License Law were retained to enforce the Scott Act, or new Commissioners and a new Inspector were appointed who were in greater sympathy with the Act.

A circular was sent by the Provincial Secretary to the members of the Legislative Assembly with respect to the Commissioners of Licenses to be recommended, containing this instruction:—"Should the Scott Act be in operation in your county, or should it have been passed so as to come in force on the 1st of May next, it will be necessary that at least the majority of the Board of Commissioners, and also the Inspector, should be men who are favorable to the Scott Act and its proper enforcement. I trust that in making your recommendation you will bear this in mind."

We got from year to year large votes from the Legislature to pay expenses which either the Dominion or the county adopting the Scott Act should have paid. When the friends of the Act represented that its enforcement by the ordinary magistrates was impracticable, we made provision for the appointment of Police Magistrates wherever County Councils should apply for their appointment. When County Councils declined to avail themselves of the privilege, we procured Legislative provision for the appointments taking place unasked. The Police Magistrates so appointed were, I believe, in every instance gentlemen in sympathy with the Act, and otherwise satisfactory to the Temperance people.

The instructions issued from the Department for the enforcement of the Act contained, amongst other things, the direction following:—"It is the duty of the Inspectors to see that the several provisions of the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, are en-

forced in their districts. They shall be specially vigilant in the prosecution of offenders for infractions of the Act, not waiting for others to make complaints. Necessary detective service required to properly discharge their duty they must not hesitate to perform." Where the Inspector seemed from the returns or from other information to be lax, increased diligence was by correspondence and personal communications insisted on, and the Inspector was warned:—"The future must show much greater efficiency on your part if you continue to act as Inspector." Complaints were sometimes made of the Inspectors. Officers cannot be dismissed on mere complaint, but when dereliction of duty was brought home to them after official investigation, we appointed in their places others, named as a rule by the Temperance people themselves.

In a word, we did our best by both Legislation and Executive action to meet the difficulty arising from the inaction, or worse than inaction, of the Dominion government. The Act, where adopted, was found to involve some business inconveniences which do not appear to have been appreciated at the time of the Act being adopted; popular hostility to the Act was developed in some quarters; popular indifference in other quarters to the enforcement of the Act became common; and the result was, that anything like complete enforcement was impossible. To ascribe the failure to the Ontario government is unjust; and to make its failure a reason for supporting the Conservative party, whose leaders in the Dominion did nothing whatever for the enforcement of this Dominion law, is surely most illogical and absurd.

Early in 1886 a special officer was employed to see to the execution of the laws, both in districts in which the Crooks Act was in force, and in districts where the Scott Act had been adopted. The gentleman selected for the office, the Rev. J. W. Manning, had been a Baptist minister, and an active and zealous Temperance worker all his life; had long been in the habit of taking a leading part in Temperance Conventions; was well known throughout the Province for his interest in Temperance work; and stood high in the confidence of Temperance people.

THE MCCULLY LETTER.

Having mentioned Mr. Manning's name, I may take the opportunity of referring to a letter of his which is habitually misinterpreted by the Opposition press, and, so misinterpreted, is frequently mentioned in their attacks on the Ontario government, a sub-

sequent letter of his explaining the facts being habitually ignored. The facts are these: Dr. McCully, a Reformer (as was supposed) wrote complaining of the lax enforcement of the Scott Act in Ridgetown, in the County of Kent. Mr. Manning immediately wrote to the Inspector there, calling his attention to the complaint. The Inspector replied that he was unaware that liquor was being openly sold in Ridgetown, that no complaints had been made to him, and that he had received no assistance from the Temperance people in the prosecutions which he had instituted. Before the letter was answered, a gentleman from Ridgetown called on Mr. Manning and expressed to him the opinion that a more vigorous enforcement of the Act in that locality would injure the government. To this suggestion Mr. Manning paid no attention, knowing that it was our wish, as it was his own, that the Act should be enforced, whatever effect the enforcement might have upon our political interests, and, in his reply to the Inspector, he said amongst other things:—"Whilst it is very desirable you should have the assistance of the friends of the law, there is no obligation on them (that can be enforced) to render such assistance, but there is an obligation on you to take such energetic action as will put a stop to proceedings that are described as a 'disgrace to the government.'"

Dr. McCully sent to the newspaper his correspondence with Mr. Manning, and the Opposition press pretended to understand it as showing that the policy of the Government was to postpone the enforcement of the Act to political considerations. Mr. Manning therefore wrote a letter, which was published, giving the facts, and this letter is systematically ignored by our opponents when they refer to the matter. This was the letter:—

TO THE EDITOR:—An effort has been made to torture the meaning of an unofficial letter written by me to Dr. McCully on the 14th inst., in reply to a communication sent by him to me, into a reflection upon the Government. The letter in question was, from force of habit, inadvertently signed by me as chief officer, though on its face it purports to be (what it was) a private communication. In the letter in question I called attention to the fact that the Ontario government is the only Provincial government that has made any effort to enforce the Scott Act. In Dr. McCully's letter, doubt as to the government's sympathy with the enforcement of the Act and the gravest suspicion as to its administration were expressed. I declined to go into any controversy with him as to these matters, and concluded my letter by referring to the well-known fact that while on the one hand the government are found fault with by some for not more strictly enforcing the provisions of the Canadian Temperance Act, others complain of its too vigorous enforcement. The instructions given to me as chief officer of the Canada Temperance Act Division are to require a strict enforcement of the Act, and those instructions I endeavor to have carried out by the local officers, as far as in my power. I

have never been influenced or controlled to any other course by the government or any member thereof, or any one else in authority, nor has any effort been made to so influence or control me, and any insinuation to that effect is quite unwarranted by the facts.

The facts therefore are, that when the complaint with respect to Ridgetown reached the Department, the Inspector was communicated with; that notwithstanding the opinion of the friend from Ridgetown that a vigorous enforcement of the law would hurt the government politically, the more vigorous enforcement of the Act was insisted on and carried out—the very contrary of what political opponents pretended to infer.

The organ of the 16th contains an elaborate communication of three columns with reference to a license granted at Mount Elgin by the License Commissioners of South Oxford. I had previously seen the communication in the *Mail*. It is full of misrepresentations and abuse of the Government, and is evidently the production of some bitter Tory. The *Nation*, to give it increased emphasis, has given to it a new heading of its own:—"The License Act—How they work it." The document argues that the license was illegal, and I understand from what it said that it was the subject of judicial inquiry before the Police Magistrate at Woodstock, and was decided to be legal. The communication states that a letter from me was handed into court by the License Inspector advising the Commissioners that it was not necessary to advertise the names of applicants for licenses last year. I wrote no such letter, and no such letter could have been handed into court. In fact I am not aware that I ever heard of the case before the communication appeared, and I had nothing whatever to do with the correspondence which took place. I have since examined the official correspondence, and find a letter from the Provincial Secretary's Department to the Inspector, intimating, amongst other things, that as the Scott Act would be in force until after 1st May, 1889, the provision of law requiring the advertising of applications received before that day did not apply, and this statement appears to have been quite right. I do not remark further on the false statements and insinuations in the document. I only refer to it and its adoption by the *Nation* as affording another illustration of the readiness of the organ to use anything and everything, correct or incorrect, which the editor thinks may be made to hurt the Ontario Government:

THE ANTI-JESUIT AGITATION.

This New Party derives part of any little strength which it

has from the agitation which the Jesuit Estates' Act in Quebec has created among the Protestants of Ontario. In that agitation, politicians who are opposed to the Ontario Government, and are under no real fear of either Irish Catholics or French Catholics, united with other Protestants, and have been strong enough and acute enough, with the aid of conscientious men of their own politics, to

PERVERT INTO CAPITAL

against the Ontario Government some of the excitement created by the recent Quebec measures and by old Quebec grievances, though the Ontario Government had nothing whatever to do with any of those measures. Designing politicians joined in anti-Jesuit meetings and Equal Right meetings with Protestant clergymen and Protestant laymen, who in the part they took were honestly discharging what they believed to be their duty. The politicians vied with the others in denouncing the Jesuit Estates' Act, and the 188 who voted against the motion for its disallowance; and they endeavored from the first to turn the agitation into hostility to the Ontario Government. They have not hitherto been strong enough to induce the Equal Rights Association to enter on a crusade against that government for the benefit of the Ontario Opposition, and I presume that they will not be able to do so.

To bring it about, Opposition newspapers have declared that I myself was the author or adviser of the Jesuit Estates' Act, though they knew perfectly that I had nothing to do with it any more than its loudest denouncers had; and I had proof the other day that even this absurd story, being frequently reiterated, had gained credence with some people. The politicians referred to brought up again the old election stories of 1886, which Reformers and other electors had then pronounced against. They insisted that their refuted and rejected charges against the Ontario government and Legislature were as well founded and of as grave a character as the objections to the Jesuit Estates' Act, and they demanded that the resolutions passed at the Equal Rights meetings should, by implication or in express language, put on the same footing the recent Quebec measures to which all were opposed, and the old enactments of the Ontario Legislature as to which parties were divided. They asserted that unless the Equal Rights resolutions embraced both, the omission would be partisanship. To avoid discord, Tory politicians were generally allowed to have, to some extent, their own way. At meetings outside of Toronto they had often more to say against the Ontario govern-

ment, and more about the charges unsuccessfully made against us in 1886, than against the Jesuit Estates' Act. In characteristic speeches it was stated that "in Ontario we have as much to fear from Jesuitism as they in Quebec," and so on; and all Protestants were called on "to lay aside party politics and act and vote on the principal of supporting the Protestant religion." This was the general tone adopted by Conservative politicians. So, in the Opposition journals, and in the speeches of Opposition orators, it was said that the Protestants of Ontario might be able to do nothing to "check Quebec," but should, at all events, put out the Ontario government. The extreme partisanship of all this must be manifest to every one before long, if it is not manifest to everyone already.

For, compare from a Protestant standpoint the trumped-up charges against the Ontario government with the complaints which had fired the Protestant sentiment of the Province. I am not going to discuss just now the demerits of the Jesuit Estates' Act; but all know that the Act was read by Protestants who took part in Anti-Jesuit meetings and Equal Rights meetings, as endowing Jesuits out of the public exchequer, the common property of Protestants and Roman Catholics; as denying the supremacy of the Queen in her own possessions; as asserting the supremacy of the Pope over the Legislature; and as endangering the civil and religious liberties of the whole Dominion. That was the view of the Act by those Protestants who took part in the agitation without a political object; and, so reading the Act, their excitement as Protestants must be admitted to have been natural and inevitable. What were the acts of the Ontario government which were presented to Protestants as in the same category with this Quebec Act, so read? Some Ontario statutes passed years before, and which, at the time of passing, neither any of the men now so furious, nor anyone else, clerical or lay, in the whole Province, objected to, or saw any harm in, or anything wrong or dangerous or objectionable in; statutes which affected no Protestant ratepayer in any appreciable degree, and which Reformers generally had at the general election of 1886, declared after full discussion to contain nothing calling for a withdrawal of their confidence in their party or their representatives.

In the absence of political party purpose, it would have been a matter of course for all who took the popular Protestant view of the Jesuit Estates' Act, to drop all matters on which the Conservatives and Reformers among them did not agree. The contrary course was the extreme of partisanship on the part of Conservative politicians. In the excitement of the period, their tactics have not been

without some temporary effect in the case of even some most excellent men with Reform leanings who, in their interest in the more important issues believed to be involved, did not perceive or appreciate the political game which our opponents were playing; and were not unnaturally carried away for a time by the boldness and fury manifested on the subject by their Conservative coadjutors and associates. I believe that when the general election comes on the aberration will be found to have passed entirely away from earnest Reformers, and that few, if any, Reformers will be found playing, through this New Party or otherwise, into the hands of the Opposition to the Ontario government. Meanwhile, I discharge my duty by calling the attention of Protestant Reformers to the tactics of our common opponents.

APPENDIX.

The following article appeared in *The Good Templar of Canada*, the Organ of the Good Templars, January 15th, 1890 :—

THE MOWAT GOVERNMENT.

THE GOOD TEMPLAR has eschewed politics from its columns believing that the best interests of our Order are served by aiding in the formation of Temperance character. Our Order is a great school for the education of the country to Temperance principles, and in helping forward that education we are hastening the time when Prohibition will be one of the fundamental laws on our statute books. But while we, as an Order, take no part in party politics, yet when the question of the liquor traffic arises, our duty is plain to help the government that gives us the best laws both in restricting the traffic by stringent License Acts and in totally prohibiting it, by a regular Prohibitory Act. Our Order was the first great Temperance Organization to raise the standard of Prohibition as the goal of its existence, and not until the liquor traffic is banished out of existence will our objects be attained. In the near future the country will be called on to elect a new Legislature for the Province of Ontario, and it becomes the duty of every Good Templar Voter to consider for whom he shall cast his ballot. There are yet many improvements wanted in our License Laws. At the last meeting of the Ontario Branch of the Dominion Alliance held in Toronto, a number of proposed amendments were discussed, among others "a reduction of the maximum number of licenses to be issued in any municipality"; "a provision that any person applying for a license shall have the consent of a majority of rate-payers in the locality in which he is to operate." "The licensing of *all* public houses"; "The abolition of steam-boat licenses," &c., &c.

These are all very important questions, and it becomes our duty to consider into whose hands we shall place the power of carrying them out. At election times many will come forward asking for the suffrages of Temperance men and promising all sorts of things if only elected. But we must look to their record. It is very easy to place a law on the statute books, but another thing to make

the machine to enforce the same, and meet the requirements of the times by amendments as actual working shows their necessity. Witness the Scott Act, the very best local option act ever passed, and yet our government at Ottawa refused, time and again, to pass amendments asked for by temperance men to make the Act workable. Now the time is coming to remind the members, that they did not represent the sentiments of the Temperance people but the liquor traffic, and relegate them to stay at home for the future.

We have headed this article "The Mowat Government," as we are under the impression that the Provincial Legislators will be the first to come before the electors. It is not necessary to make any remarks about the personnel of that government, they are known to most of our readers; but we may be allowed to mention the names of two, who we are interested in as members of the Order, and who hold no mean place in the Cabinet, viz.: the Hon. G. W. Ross, LL.D., Minister of Education, and the Hon. Mr. Drury, the Minister of Agriculture. Both of these gentlemen are no figure-head Temperance men, but were active members of our Order before entering the ministry and are so still. In trying to carry out the laws for the restriction of the liquor traffic, we might also mention that the ministry cannot be accused of putting their enforcement into the hands of the liquor party, when we remember that they intrusted the enforcement to J. W. Manning, P.G.W.P., of the Sons of Temperance, and also for many years Bro. T. W. Casey, P.G. Secretary of our Order was engaged in the same duty. Mr. Mowat's government have always shown a desire to meet the wants and desires of Temperance men in passing legislation favorable to Temperance Reform, and on no occasion, that we are aware of, have they ever refused to make any amendments to our laws that were deemed necessary. It therefore becomes our duty to do all in our power to strengthen their hands, and not to be carried away by wordy politicians, who are full of promises at election times. Actions are what we want, and the following record of the Mowat government speaks for itself:—

They passed Acts which, with their amendments,

(1) Removed the power exercised over Municipal Councils by the liquor interest that had formerly virtually controlled the Councils;

(2) Created Boards of Commissioners and Inspectors free from local control or interference, with special instructions to enforce the stringent provisions of the License Act;

(3) Reduced the number of licenses to be issued, and limited their issue to a population basis ;

(4) Gave power to Municipal Councils by by-law, or to the Board of Commissioners by regulation, to still further reduce the number ;

(5) Gave authority to any ten electors of any polling sub-division by petition to object to any licenses being issued within the sub division and to be heard in its support, and power to Board to grant the petition ;

(6) Gave the majority of electors in polling sub-divisions the power by petition to prohibit altogether the granting of any license in any sub-division ;

(7) Prohibited the issue of licenses or the sale of liquors in agricultural or fair grounds ;

(8) Prohibited the sale of liquors on Saturday nights and Sundays ;

(9) Prohibited sales on election days, Parliamentary and municipal ;

(10) Prohibited sales on ferry boats and vessels in port ;

(11) Improved the accommodation of all taverns and imposed penalties for drunkenness and disorderly conduct therein ;

(12) Separated the sale of liquors in shops from the sale of groceries and other goods ;

(13) Prohibited, under penalties, loitering in bar-rooms on Saturday nights and Sundays ;

(14) Prohibited the organization of clubs with the object or purpose of selling liquors, and thereby defeating the provisions of the License Act restricting sales ;

(15) Provided for the punishment of the purchasers of liquors as well as the sellers on Sundays, or from unlicensed persons ;

(16) Increased the facilities by civil remedy against tavern-keepers for selling liquors to those who drink to excess ;

(17) Provided for restriction and prohibition of sales to such persons ;

(18) Provided for the appointment of Commissioners and Inspectors to enforce the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act and the Temperance Act of 1864. The Dominion Act makes special provision for its enforcement by Dominion officers, who, notwithstanding, refused to enforce the Act. No other Government except Ontario passed laws or appointed officers to enforce the Act in any sense ;

(19) Provided, by statute, for the appointment of Police Magistrates for the enforcement of the Scott Act, upon request of the County Councils.

Mr. Mowat's government also recommended to the Legislature a compulsory measure by which these Magistrates could be appointed, and the Councils be compelled to pay their salaries, either out of the fines collected or out of general funds.

The power of the Provincial Legislature to control the liquor traffic was saved by the determined action of Mr. Mowat in contesting two great constitutional questions as to :—

(1) The power of the Local Legislatures to appoint Commissioners, and their power to pass restrictive regulations respecting licensed taverns. (Queen v. Hodge.)

(2) The authority of the Dominion government and Legislature to override Provincial law and to interfere in the local question of granting licenses.
